



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/579,872	05/26/2000	Jeffrey Steven Albrecht	00JSA001	9690

7590 11/19/2003

Eugene Moraz Esq  
Morgan & Finnegan LLP  
345 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10154

EXAMINER
----------

KAPADIA, MILAN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/579,872	ALBRECHT, JEFFREY STEVEN1	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Milan S Kapadia	2143	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Milan S Kapadia. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Richard Martinelli (Reg. NO. 52,003). (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 10 November 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: All of record in general and claim 21 in particular.

Identification of prior art discussed: Brown (6,161,095).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: : Applicant discussed the differences between the claimed invention and the applied prior art. Specifically the Applicant argued how the "self-administration" treatment step of the claimed invention was different than that of the applied prior art. The Examiner held that the prior art did teach the recited features by giving the "self-administration" treatment step its broadest reasonable interpretation. The Examiner suggested claim language that would more clearly distinguish claimed invention over the prior art. In particular, the Examiner suggested clarifying that the patient was the one creating the treatment regimen that was used to self-administer the treatment. The Examiner will re-consider the applied prior art in view of any amendments submitted by the Applicant, assuming there is support for the amendments in the originally filed specification.